UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,895	07/19/2005	Carina Sacha Snijder	4662-31	8425
23117 NIXON & VAN	7590 10/15/200 NDERHYE, PC	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH G	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	RUDDOCK, ULA CORINNA		
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/537,895	SNIJDER ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Ula C. Ruddock	1794			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earmed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Au	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-9 is/are withdrawn is 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or are subject to restriction and/or are subjected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ access Applicant may not request that any objection to the or is/are:	r election requirement. r. epted or b)□ objected to by the B				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/20/05.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite			

Application/Control Number: 10/537,895 Page 2

Art Unit: 1794

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I in the reply filed on August 10, 2007, is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitt et al. (US 6,669,706). Schmitt et al. disclose multifilament surgical support mesh exhibiting improved resistance to inhabitation of bacteria and other infectious matter (col 1, ln 14-17). Schmitt discloses prior art wherein the surgical mesh comprises polyethylene (col 1, ln 55). The surgical mesh can be knitted and is produced from multifilament yarns (col 1, ln 28-36). The multifilament yarns can be bicomponent yarns composed of a sheath and core (col 6, ln 9-12). The yarns are encapsulated within a matrix that provides an infection-impervious barrier (col 5, ln 19-31). A medicinal substance is incorporated into the matrix encapsulating the yarns (col 7, ln 7-12). Schmitt et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the teaching that the polyethylene yarn has a tensile strength of more than 1.0 GPa, a relative viscosity of more than 5 dl/g, and that the yarn is formed of a sheath and core having a weight ratio between the sheath and core of below 5:1 or 3:1.

Application/Control Number: 10/537,895

Art Unit: 1794

Although Schmitt et al. do not disclose the tensile strength property and relative viscosity property, it is inherent to presume that these properties are inherent to the polyethylene yarns of Schmitt et al. Support for said presumption is found in the use of like materials (i.e. multifilament, bicomponent polyethylene yarns). The burden is upon Applicant to prove otherwise. *In re Fitzgerald*, 205 USPQ 594. In addition, the presently claimed property of a polyethylene yarn having a tensile strength of more than 1.0 GPa, a relative viscosity of more than 5 dl/g would obviously have been present once the Schmitt et al. product is provided. Note *In re Best*, 195 USPQ at 433, footnote 4 (CCPA 1977).

Page 3

Finally, in the absence of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the weight ratio between the sheath and core be below 5:1 or 3:1, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. In the present invention, one would have made the weight ratio between the sheath and core be below 5:1 or 3:1, motivated by the desire to create a mesh material that has the desired pliability and structural integrity.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ula C. Ruddock whose telephone number is 571-272-1481. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

Application/Control Number: 10/537,895 Page 4

Art Unit: 1794

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel H. Morris can be reached on 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/U. C. R./

/Ula C Ruddock/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794